

National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing Inc.

White Resettlement

NCDH 1978 white resettlement survey has found that very little white resettlement has been identified by survey recipient in 32 inner-city neighborhoods. However, in these inner-city neighborhoods where white resettlement was identified, it was found that minority families in varying numbers were being displaced because of private purchasing of houses for residence by whites.

Survey Objective:

- A. to measure the extent of white resettlement
- B. to determine the effect of white resettlement upon the opportunities of minorities for fair housing.

Defining White Resettlement:

NCDH defines white resettlement as the transition of an inner-city neighborhood from predominantly black occupancy to predominantly white occupancy, usually accomplished by private purchase of older houses for extensive renovation, resulting in a rapid upward movement of property values and rents often accompanied by brisk activity by investors, speculators and brokers.

Methodology

In June of 1978, 166 housing planners, minority brokers and community leaders in 37 cities across the country were asked to give their opinion whether white resettlement was occurring in neighborhoods of their city. Altogether survey forms were returned from 32 neighborhoods in 21 cities, as follows:

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Neighborhoods</u>
Baltimore, Md.....	2
Boston, Ma.....	4
Chicago, Il.....	1
Denver, Co.....	4
Hartford, Ct.....	2
Indianapolis, In.....	5
Kansas, City, Mo.....	2
Los Angeles, Ca.....	2
Milwaukee, Wi.....	2
New Orleans, La.....	1
Philadelphia, Pa.....	3
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1
San Francisco, Ca.....	1
Washington, D.C.....	1
Seattle, Wa.....	1

Respondents from seven of the above cities returned survey forms stating that there were examples of white resettlement occurring, but only five identified the neighborhoods of their city in which it was taking place, as follows:

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Names of Neighborhoods</u>
Baltimore, Md.	1	Harwood
Boston, Ma.	1	Ashmony Hill
Indianapolis, In.	2	Northside Herron Morton
Los Angeles, Ca.	NA	NA

<u>City</u>	<u>No. of Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Names of Neighborhoods</u>
Philadelphia	3	Washington West, Center City and Franklinton-Fairmont
Seattle, Wa	NA	MA
Washington, D.C.	1	Gold Coast

Survey Results

Due to the limited number of responses, caution must be exercised in extrapolating the findings for national significance. The survey data is only approximately indicative of trends affecting some cities.

Analysis of the survey responses showed that different degrees of racial changes occurred because of white resettlement in the eight neighborhoods identified by respondents. We have grouped the differing degrees into three categories typifying situations.

Category A

Neighborhoods that underwent a racial change from predominantly black to predominantly white. (Philadelphia's Center City and Franklinton-Fairmont and Washington's Gold Coast.)

Category B

Neighborhoods in which white resettlement was stated to be occurring but the predominant race of the residents presently remains black. (Baltimore's Harwood and Indianapolis' Northside and Herron Morton.)

Neighborhoods in which, prior to resettlement and now, the predominate race is white, but experiencing resettlement of whites in minority pocket areas. (Boston's Ashmony Hill and Philadelphia's Washington West.)

General Finding:

General survey findings are given basedon the eight neighborhoods in categories A, B, and C.

- With the exception of two neighborhoods, the primary cause given as to why white resettlement has occurred was private purchase of homes for renovation because of the lack of comparably priced similar housing in other areas of the city.
- White resettlement in the above neighborhoods has resulted in minority residents being displaced.
- Of the displaced minority households, 53% gave evidence of wanting to stay in the neighborhood.
- Tenants displaced by private acquisition, usually could not find similar housing available at approximately the same rent. In addition, most displacees could not afford to move to housing of similar quality and conveniences.

- Three survey responses recorded that most displacees in their areas moved to neighborhoods that were more segregated.
- Displacees were mainly renters
- Local governments and community groups are now utilizing programs and strategies to minimize displacement in three neighborhoods surveyed.
- Average family income for the neighborhoods surveyed was \$7,800, prior to white resettlement.
- Following white resettlement, the estimated average income rose to \$22,000 for these neighborhoods, with the estimated family income for new families at \$27,000.

Findings for Each Resettlement Type Category

Category A

Prior to resettlement, Philadelphia's Center City, Franklintown-Fairmont and Washington's Gold Coast (Piney Branch to ¹⁶ Portal Drive and 35th ¹⁶ Blagden Road) were predominantly black neighborhoods.

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>% Pop. Black</u>	<u>% Pop. White</u>
Center City	60	30
Franklintown-Fairmont	55	30
Gold Coast	NA	AN

Presently, Center City, Franklinton-Fairmont and Gold Coast neighborhoods have changed virtually from an integrated neighborhood to "predominantly white". (For Franklinton-Fairmont, the white proportion is estimated at 80%.) The Gold Coast area survey recorded that, along with its racial change, white-owner occupancy has increased.

The ~~sell~~ing price of an unrenovated house in Philadelphia's Center City and Franklinton-Fairmont was reported as \$11,000 and \$14,500 respectively. The rent of an unrenovated unit was \$175 per month and \$110 for the same two neighborhoods. Although cost data was omitted for Washington's Gold Coast area, the survey recorded that this area was predominantly black-renter occupied.

Today, an estimated 80% of the renovated units in Center City and Franklinton-Fairmont have become occupied by new white residents within the past five years. In the Gold Coast area, while 50% of the renovated units were occupied by white residents, black occupancy and access to these renovated units was stated to be virtually none.

For all three neighborhoods, the selling price of a renovated house averaged out at \$70,000 and the rent of renovated units averaged out at ~~\$~~375 per month.

In all three neighborhoods, blacks and hispanics were stated to be the victims of displacement because of white resettlement. The total number and the exact percentage of the displacees were left unreported. Each survey, however, stated that displacees usually migrated to housing that was basically the same, but in neighborhoods that were more segregated and less convenient.

Lack of comparatively priced housing in other parts of the city and suburbs and speculation by white investors were the two major reasons given to why whites resettled in these neighborhoods.

Although these neighborhoods remain predominantly black (Herron-Morton 85% and Northside 70%), some white occupancy is taking place and is stated to be causing displacement of minority families.

Though stated to be an example of a community with white resettlement (NCDH's definition) at the present time, blacks were stated to still be the predominant race in each of three neighborhoods. For example, white occupancy in the Northside neighborhood has increased from 30% to 35%.

Minority households occupied none of the renovated structures that were occupied by new residents within the past five years in the three neighborhoods. In Herron-Morton, whites occupied 100% of the renovated units. In Northside, whites occupied 45%. In Harwood, they occupied only 6%.

In addition, almost all minority households who were displaced by whites resettlers in these neighborhoods gave evidence of wanting to stay.

Response to all three neighborhoods indicated that if present trends continue the racial composition eventually will change from predominantly black to white.

In Harwood and Herron-Morton, lack of comparably priced housing elsewhere was the major reason by white resettlement has occurred. Old Northside express continuous heavy speculation of investors as its major reasons.

The Harwood neighborhood described programs and strategies that their local government and community groups were utilizing to minimize white resettlement.

A neighborhood coalition group in Northside has solicited local and state political support to defend their effort in preventing white resettlement. Northside survey state that the denial of CDBG funds helped change the racial composition of the neighborhood. Instead of providing funds for property

acquisition and rehabilitation activities for neighborhood residents wanting to remain, the CDBG program provided funds for relocation payments to displaced blacks.

Prior to resettlement, whites were already the predominant race in Boston's Ashmony Hill and Philadelphia's Washington West, ~~Constituting 60% of the population in Washington West,~~ with 15% black and 25% others.

Although, as of this date, whites were stated to be the predominant race in both neighborhoods, a decrease in black population was predicted by each recipient.

The resettlement of whites in newly renovated units in black and other non-white ethnic communities was the major reason given for a decreasing black population in Washington West. The displacees, a result of the surging white influx, were forced to move outside of the Washington West area where they couldn't find housing of similar prior quality and convenience. Convenience and cost of commuting were the primary reasons given for whites resettling into minority section of Washington West.

The percent of renovated units occupied by whites in Washington West was 95%, with blacks occupying only 1%.

In Ashmony Hill, black population decrease was not attributed to white resettlement, this resulting in the displacement of blacks. In fact, of the 205 newly renovated units in Ashmony Hill, 10% were occupied by minority households. White resettlement, was viewed by this participant as reducing the housing abandonment in the neighborhood.

Private purchase of older houses because of the lack of comparably priced housing in other parts of city was the major reason given for whites resettling in the Ashmony Hill district.

Ashmony Hill has provided mortgage rental assistance and financial legal counseling to potential displacees to offset white resettlement.

The Washington West district cited that the city's redevelopment policies intentionally permitted more expensive housing to be located there, therefore, causing white resettlement.

Definition of White Resettlement

NCDH defines white resettlement as "the transition of inner-city neighborhoods from predominantly black occupancy to predominantly white occupancy, usually accomplished by private purchase of older houses for extensive renovation, resulting in a rapid upward movement of property values and rentals, accompanied by brisk activity by investors, speculators, and brokers".

To incorporate the cause, (private purchase of older houses for extensive renovation) and result (rapid upward movement of

property values and rentals, accompanied by brisk activity by investors, speculators and brokers) indicates that the objective of the survey is to measure the extent and determine the results of white resettlemen caused by private reinvestment in selected city neighborhoods. This objective cannot address the following questions simply because the questionnaire was not designed to probe and give answers (even speculative) to these specific questions:

1. Why is white resettlement occurring?
2. What are the causes of white resettlement?
3. Whether white resettlement is good or bad?
4. What do whites want beyond charming old house at a good price?
5. Do whites want an all-white (or least an all-middle class) neighborhood?

It is still very confusing to why was public governmental programs introduced in the survey as a possible cause.

Methods and Conclusion

The researcher(s) who designed the survey used in the inductive method approach to test NCDH's assumptions on white resettlement. (Whether they knew they were using this research approach is unknown.) However, when assuming that each local recipient chosen will be in close accordance with the subject area and social life therefore, providing descriptive information, was a very poor assumption to make. Primarily because of the lack and quality of data that the 1975 survey produced, heavy emphasis should have been given to this step during the development stages of the survey. The 1975 white resettlement survey concluded the following:

"It was thought that if at least 3 of the six participant categories replied to our questionnaires, we would be able to correlate any information received, and get a clearer picture of what was happening in each city. Unfortunately, response was low. In no city did we get more than one positive response, so that cross-checking of information was not possible. And in some cities, even though a positive response was indicated, survey forms were never returned. It would have proven to be too costly to survey for additional information by telephone, because the kind of information needed for any in depth analysis was not available to those who did respond".

Collecting data is a very important step in doing any type of research whether using the inductive method approach or the hypothetical deductive approach. Training by NCDH staff to local researchers was a step that should have been considered. These local researchers would record their observations, explorations and inspections and thus would have assured our central staff a richness of data amount and quality. (ex. Urban Coalition)

Defining Displacement

Many agencies, organizations, and private consultant firms defined displacement before examining the subject. Different definitions were given by each group for different purposes. (For example, a different definition is needed to examine displacement caused by private revitalization than by abandonment or by Federal programs.)

Three Major Definitions of displacement

A. National Commission on Neighborhoods

The National Commission on Neighborhoods defined displacement as "an involuntary movement from household because of reasons beyond the tenant control.

B. George and Eunice Grier suggested the following definition of displacement:

"Displacement occurs when any household is forced to move from its residence by conditions which affect the dwelling or its immediate surroundings and which: (1) are beyond the household's reasonable ability to control or prevent; (2) occur despite the household's having met all previously imposed conditions of occupancy; and (3) make continued occupancy of that household impossible, hazardous, or unaffordable."

The Grier report attempted to measure displacement caused by public action, direct displacement through private reinvestment, and other private displacement.

Therefore, the Griers defined displacement broadly to include displacement from disinvestment, reinvestment, and other overall market changes.

The Griers elected to keep out the phrase "voluntary" and "involuntary movement" of people simply because they saw no clear cut line between the two. The Griers stated that "a resident may voluntary move because of increases in rent taxes before the landlord issues notices of eviction, resulting in a few occupants may be left. Some may call it voluntary -- someone else may call it involuntary movement".

C. Department of Housing Urban Development

The Department of Housing and Urban Development did not establish a single defintion of displacement. HUD, however, stated two approaches to define displacement.

Their first definition rests on the concept of an involuntary move caused by conditions beyond the household's control. "This definition includes circumstances not often associated with the term 'displacement', such as displacement caused by abandonment and the withdrawal of essential services or maintenance, as well as displacement caused by sudden large increases in taxes or rent which price units out of the reach of current residents."

The second definition "distinguishes between causal factors

involved in displacement, beginning with displacement occurring as a result by a public agency, and covering other displacement directly and indirectly caused by Federal actions, displacement caused by state and local activity, and displacement not associated with public activity but caused by private market factors.

Brief Summarization of Major Displacement Reports and Paper

A. The National Commission on Neighborhoods

In this paper NCN addressed the problem of "how to keep from being pushed out of their neighborhoods against their will or inclination regardless of the reason". The paper deal with five major areas, (1) the definition of displacement; (2) a discussion of the dimensions of the problems; (3) a discussion of the Federal role, including the Uniform Relocation Act; (4) examples of innovative programs to alleviate displacement; and (5) policy recommendation for a strategy of nondisplacement.

B. The Grier Report, prepared for the Dept of HUD, attempted to measure displacement caused by public action, direct displacement through private reinvestment, and other private displacement.

The Grier's surveyed 14 cities in 1977 and found relatively little displacement reported by local agencies (public action) responsible for relocating displacees.

The Grier's using a different approach, measured displacement as a result of gentrification and concluded the following:

- ° "gentrification" seems to be especially prevalent in cities with large concentrations of white collar employment in concentrations of white collar Washington, D.C. and San Francisco.
- ° reinvestment is increasingly widespread, but in most cities where it is occurring it is till quite limited scope
- ° most major cities probably have some degree of reinvestment underway now
- ° in most cases, it is quite recent and appears to be growing in scope and in numbers.
- ° reinvestment still appears to be far from universal. The Griers were unable to find any indication of it in a number of cities, especially in the small to middle range.

C. The Department of Housing and Urban Development first report studied the nature and extent of displacement. Out of the study, HUD suggested recommendations to minimize involuntary displacement caused by HUD's programs and public and private financed developments.

In the interim report HUD: (1) discussed approached to the definition of displacement, (2) summarized current available information on displacement and (3) addressed displacement caused directly or indirectly by Federal program, emphasising their own Department's program.

The interim report concluded that displacement caused by urban revitalization is a relatively small phenomenon nationwide. The report stated that "out of 14 million households that moved during 1974 to 1976, only 3.8 percent were displaced and that displacement caused by private actions was more prevalent than that caused by federal action."

The second report, in response to findings of the interim report, differed somewhat in tone calling displacement a very serious problem in areas of major cities.* This report proposed changes in HUD policies and programs that will minimize involuntary displacement. This report also contained a series of proposals for Federal aid to local governments and private organization to alleviate the displacement problem.

D. Neighborhood Revitalization Report: The Recent Experience in Large American Cities, Phillip Clay surveyed 30 large cities in 1978 to see if gentrification was going on (private displacement). His findings revealed that some gentrification was going on, in addition to a great amount of "incumbent upgrading". In the report, Clay estimated the number of units involved in revitalization as relatively small. He notes that "for every neighborhood which has been revitalized in recent years, several have slipped into more intractable state of disinvestment and decay".

E. Kathryn Nelson analyzed the movement of blacks and whites between central cities and suburbs in 11 metropolitan areas between 1955-1975. Addressing displacement, she concluded that:

A. The post-1970 return to the city has been small in

* Revitalization being done by existing residents.

magnitude and has not represented much of a departure from past tendencies towards decentralization

B. movement into 11 of the nation's largest central cities was neither large enough to promise spontaneous revitilization nor massive enough to threaten widespread displacement of the poor and disadvantaged

F. The National Urban Coalition studied private market neighborhood revitilization (gentrification) in 44 cities. The Urban Coalition confirmed that private revitilization was taken place in the 44 cities. Briefly, the Urban Coalition found that.

- a. incomes of households moving into neighborhoods under priavte market rehabilitation are higher than those of previous residents
- b. professional and white collar workers tend to displace blue collar workers and the unemployed.
- c. those displaced are mostly elderly.
- d. in some areas that one minority is displaced by a different minority*

The Coalition study also goes on to identify four different phases of private market rehabilitation.

G. Unpublished data throws some additional light on the displacement problem. One major-unpublished tabulation, based on Annual Housing Survey data, movers were asked the main reasons for their move. Among the possible responses were displaced by

* NCDH survey focused on this aspect of displacement

urban renewal, highway construction, or other public activity, and displacement by private action. The tabulations revealed the following:

- a. households responding positively to these questions shows that "number of displaced households annually is in excess of one-half million. In 1974, 522,000 households were displaced; in 1975, 519,000; and in 1976, 541,000."
- b. About 70% of those displaced were in metropolitan areas. (no separate breakdown is provided for central cities).
- c. Less than 20% of the displacement reported was attributable to government programs.

Federal Displacement Policies and Strategies to Minimize Displacement

Although displacement caused by Federal action is covered by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Act and is small relative to displacement occurring for other reasons, much criticism has been given to both the Uniform Relocation Act. and its administration by a number of Federal agencies.

The Uniform Relocation Act is intended to "provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and Federally assisted programs. Its purpose is to prevent individuals from suffering disproportionate injuries as a result of programs designed to benefit the general public."

Although Federal agencies have carried out the act, many displaced people are said to be receiving little or no relocation assistance because of the limited coverage of the act.

The General Accounting Office Found that an "inconsistent, inequitable and confusing array of different formats, terminologies, and guidelines in 13 Federal agencies regulations" resulted in people being treated differently when displaced by these agencies.

Some of the inequities caused by limitations in the act are:

1. Federal agencies have taken the view that The act applies only to displacement caused by Federal agencies or by State agencies receiving Federal financial assistance. Often, however, Federal financial assistance is provided to organizations other than State agencies for projects which displace people and businesses. When this happens, few if any relocation benefit are provided.
2. The Uniform Relocation Act calls for coordination among Federal agencies, however, each issues its own regulations. Because these regulations are not uniform, displaced homeowners and tenants receive differing payments for replacement housing, rental assistance, and situation where comparable replacement housing is not available.
3. Replacement housing payment for both homeowners (15,000) and renters (4,000) is to low as well as payments for moving and related expenses.

The Department of HUD

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 decreased its coverage under the relocation act. Activities not involving acquisition of property, such as code enforcement and rehabilitation were covered

by the relocation act at first, however, HUD and the courts agreed tha similar activities now carried out under the act were not subject to the relocation act. This meant tha relocation benefits were no longer required to be paid to displaced persons when "there is no acquisition of property". HUD also insisted that the Uniform Relocation Act do not extend to tenants displaced in the following ways:

1. By HUD from HUD-held property acquired under the National Housing Act's mortgage insurance programs.
2. By private developers when the development is insured and subsidized by HUD
3. As a result of code enforcement and other and neighborhood Revitalization programs funded under HUD's Community Development Block Grant Program.

Presently, reliable data do not exist on the levels of displacement occurring under HUD programs not covered by the Uniform Relocation Act.

Policies and Strategies to Minimize Displacement

Uniform Relocation Act Amendment

Presently, a bill was introduced to amend the Uniform Relocation and Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

The Sasser amendment broadened the eligibility for aid to persons who lived close to but not on the site of the Federal project or program. In addition the bill extended coverage to persons displaced by private entity which had received Federal assistance.

To bring uniformity to the act, the bill called for the president to designate one agency to establish a single set of regulations and procedures applicable to all Federal supported relocation activity.

Another important change the bill proposed was the provision to increase the replacement housing payment for both homeowners and renters. For the homeowners, the 15,000 ceiling was lifted; for the renter, the 4,000 replacement benefit. In addition, payments for moving and related expenses was doubled and renters no longer need to match any part of it.

HUD's New Approach to the Displacement Program

In a recently published report, the Department of Housing and Urban Development stated a general goal addressing displacement. The goal stated that "no person shall be displaced as a direct result of a HUD or HUD-associated program or activity unless an affordable, decent safe and sanitary replacement dwelling is available".

According to the report, HUD has proposed (in order to meet their recently adopted goal), additional Federal assistance to local governments and private organizations" to alleviate the problems caused by displacement due to privately-financed development as well as their own HUD program".

Some of the specific actions HUD stated in the report that would take are:

1. Incorporation into all its programs a policy that potential displacement would be considered in funding decisions.
2. Data collection to improve monitoring of displacement occurring in connection with HUD programs, which are not subject to Uniform Relocation Act.

3. Recipients of HUD assistance to make sure that relocation assistance is provided
4. Anti-displacement policies to be developed in all HUD programs.
5. Although revised CDBG regulations gives localities the opportunity to use CDBG funds for relocation assistance, and CDBG applicants now submitting a strategy on how the needs of persons displaced by CD-funded activities would be addressed, CDBG and Urban Development action grant applicants would be asked "to indicate the efforts they will make to enable displaced persons to remain in their neighborhoods if they prefer." In addition, the block grant and action grant applicants, also project owners in the Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Program, who propose to use funds for rehabilitation, would be encouraged to minimize displacement by allowing eligible tenants to remain in the building after the rehabilitation work is completed.
6. For HUD-Insured Multifamily Rental Projects, HUD would require that tenants be notified and allowed to comment on certain actions for multifamily projects.
7. The revision for Section 8 New Construction, Substantial Rehabilitation and State Housing Agencies would include "a guarantee that tenants to be displaced will be given a reasonable choice of opportunities to move to a suitable replacement dwelling unit that is decent, safe and sanitary and

within their ability to pay". It also would require the "project owner to provide adequate notice, assistance in relocating to a suitable unit, and reasonable moving and related expenses to any residential tenant who must be permanently or temporarily relocated as a direct result of the project". For the new Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation program, the regulations state that "no application for the program will be approved of permanent displacement of tenants will be necessary unless the PHA has submitted and HUD has approved a relocation strategy."

To the concern of NCDH, the report stated solutions to address the needs of persons who are displaced by private reinvestment. One solution called for the participation and cooperation of state and local governments, neighborhood organization, and the private sector. The report said that this group "will share the responsibility with the Federal government for dealing with displacement caused by private investments." HUD has also proposed to "continue to provide and encourage the provision of lower-income housing resources to areas undergoing extensive revitalization and displacement."

HUD listed the following actions that they would take to alleviate private displacement:

1. Revising the Annual Housing Survey to provide additional information on displacement.
2. HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research to work on several studies dealing with displacement. These studies will focus on revitalization and displacement in 12 neighborhoods, a single-city intensive displacement analysis, local government

monitoring of displacement research, an analysis of legal issues surrounding displacement, and a study involving displacement in Baltimore neighborhoods.

3. HUD's Section 235 homeownership to be modified so that it can better serve as a resource for displaced households. Preference will be given to involuntary displacees, in addition, HUD will increase Section 235 mortgage limits in revitalization areas.
4. HUD sponsored conferences and publication materials all dealing with displacement strategies.

Condominium-Cooperative Conversion Moratorium Act of 1979

A 1975 HUD study of condominiums and cooperatives revealed that the "increased rate of condominium conversion has resulted in a significant amount of displacement in such major cities as Chicago, San Francisco and Washington, D.C." Tenant displacement was also found to be a serious and prevalent problem of conversions.

The Condominium-Cooperative Conversion Moratorium Act of 1979, a bill which was introduced in Congress recently, would prohibit the conversion of existing rental housing to condominiums and cooperatives for three years while a national commission studies the conversion issue.

The major provisions of the bill would:

- Effectively prohibit the conversion of rental housing to condominiums and cooperative for a 3-year period -- long enough to give a Presidential Commission in Problems Relating to Condominium- Cooperative Conversions time to study the situation, recommend solutions and get national legislation passed to deal with the problem.

- Ease the difficulties faced by displaced tenants by requiring developers to provide them with relocation assistance and by providing tax relief to tenants who are forced to move as a result of the conversion of their building to a condominium or a cooperative.
- Force localities to either regulate the conversion process or guarantee adequate housing to displaced tenants by placing restriction on community development block grants.
- Would reduce the tax incentives that currently encourage conversion and would increase the tax advantages of owning and rehabilitating rental housing.

Bibliography

1. Clay, Phillip L., Neighborhood Revitalization: the Recent Experience in Large American Cities, MIT, 1978
2. Dolbeare, Cushing, Involuntary Displacement: A Major Issue for People and Neighborhoods, Prepared for the National Commission on Neighborhoods, November, 1978
3. General Accounting Office, Changes Needed in the Relocation Act to Achieve More Uniform Treatment of Persons Displaced by Federal Programs, GAO, CGD-78-6, March 8, 1978
4. Grier, George and Eunice, Urban Displacement: A Reconnaissance, Prepared for Office of Secretary, HUD, March 1978
5. HUD/Census Annual Housing Survey, 1974-76, Recent Movers File, Unpublished to National Urban League, August 1978.
6. National Urban Coalition, Displacement: City Neighborhoods in Transition, 1978
7. Nelson, Kathryn P., Movement of Blacks and White Between Central Cities and Suburbs in 11 Metropolitan Areas, 1955-75, HUD, May 1978
8. US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Displacement Report, January 1979
9. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Final Displacement Report, November 1979
10. National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing Inc, White Resettlement I, May 1976